

REMARKS

The Rejections Under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

The term “or” has been deleted from the definition of X to clarify the meaning thereof.

Hydrogen has been deleted from the definition of R² in claims 3 and 4. This was inadvertently left in last time. The independent claim 6 should have the broadest definition for R².

The terms “-C₂H₄-, -C₃H₆-“ were changed to “C₂- or C₃-alkyl” in the definition of R² in claim 3. This is the correction of an obvious error where the correction is also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. See also claims 6 and 4 for support for the correction and the corresponding text in the specification.

The Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e) and 103(a) over Brumby

Claim 11 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering these rejections moot.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a) over Dahmann

All the previous arguments over this reference are incorporated herein.

Dahmann has a very broad generic disclosure which does not render obvious the claims of the present application.

Moreover, every single compound in the disclosure of Dahmann would have to be modified in at least two locations, for which modifications no teaching or suggestion is provided, in order to arrive at a compound of the present claims.

Such disclosure is inadequate under patent law to render obvious an invention.

Reconsideration is respectfully and courteously solicited.

Double Patenting

Claim 41 is amended rendering this rejection moot.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: SCH-1995

Date: June 17, 2008

K:\Sch\1000 to 1999\1995\Reply Jun 08.doc